THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE L.NARASIMHA REDDY

W.P.No.2013 of 2006

Date:02.02.2006

V.Babaiah.

----------Petitioner

The Depot Manager.

----------Respondent

ORDER:

The petitioner is employed as a Driver in APSRTC. He was issued a Charge Sheet, dated 26.03.1996, alleging that he caused an accident on 06.03.1996, and was required to submit explanation as to why necessary disciplinary action shall not be taken against him. The petitioner submitted his explanation on 09.04.1996. On a consideration of the same, the respondent passed an order, dated 18.11.1997, imposing the penalty of stoppage of annual increment for a period of one year and further directed that it shall have the cumulative effect on the future increments. The petitioner challenges the same.

The only point urged by Mr.S.A.K.Mynoddin, the learned counsel for the petitioner, is that the respondent imposed the penalty of stoppage of annual increment for a period of one year with cumulative effect without conducting departmental enquiry. He placed reliance upon the judgment of the Apex Court in ***KULWANTH SINGH GILL v. STATE OF PUNJAB*** and submits that stoppage of increment is a major penalty and it cannot be imposed, except by conducting departmental enquiry.

Sri P.Vinayaka Swamy, the learned Standing Counsel appearing for the respondent, on the other hand, submits that the penalty imposed against the petitioner itself is minimal, if the lapse on his part is taken into account.

It is a matter of record that the respondent imposed the penalty of stoppage of annual increment for a period of one year with cumulative effect, on the allegation that the petitioner caused an accident on 06.03.1996. Though a charge sheet was issued to the petitioner before the penalty was imposed, no departmental enquiry was conducted. I n ***KULWANTH SINGH GILL's case*** (supra), the Supreme Court held that stoppage of increments with cumulative effect is a major penalty and it cannot be imposed, except by conducting departmental enquiry.

In the ordinary course of things, the impugned order needs to be set aside, leaving it open to the respondent to pass fresh orders. To avoid further delay and complication in the mater, this Court is of the view that the impugned order can be treated as the one for stoppage of annual increment for a period of one year without cumulative effect.

Hence, the writ petition is partly allowed, directing that the order, dated 18.11.1997, passed by the respondent, shall be treated as the one for stoppage of annual increment for a period of one year without cumulative effect and that the petitioner shall not be entitled for any monetary benefits up to the date of this order. There shall be no order as to costs.

_____

01.02.2006

Jsu